

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the review of the present application. Claims 2, 8, and 10 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application.

Objections to the Specification

The Office objected to the Abstract for failing to fall within the range of 50 to 150 words. Applicants have amended the Abstract to fall within the proper word number range. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regard as the invention. This rejection is traversed. Claims 2 and 8, and 10 were amended to correct typographic errors and to improve readability of the claims. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 2, 8, and 10 as well as claims 3-7 which eventually depend from claim 2 are definite under section 112. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the section 112 rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lambert (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,478)("Lambert") in view of Rubin et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,809,140)("Rubin"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit that many differences exist between the claimed inventions and the disclosures of Lambert and Rubin but for the sake of brevity, only some will be discussed below. As will be fully explained, Lambert and Rubin individually or in combination do not disclose or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 11, or 20 as is required to raise a prima facie case of section 103 obviousness.

With respect to the Lambert reference, claims 1, 11, and 20 include the feature of a stateless client. Applicant respectfully submits that Lambert does not disclose or suggest this feature. The Office on page 4, paragraph 9 of the Office Action dated April 22, 2004 states that "Lambert did not specifically disclose that the client is a stateless client." Therefore, Applicant submits that Lambert does not include the feature of the stateless client.

With respect to the Rubin reference, the Office cites column 3, lines 20-23, line 67, column 4, lines 1-2 and suggests that "the client that communicates with the server maybe implemented as stateless clients." (Office Action, page 4, paragraph 9). Applicants respectfully traverse this suggestion. Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of Rubin cited by the Office disclose usage of a "smart card". Applicants respectfully submit that the "smart card" as disclosed by Rubin is not a stateless client as defined or used within the specification of the present patent application and is not coupled to a server. Rubin utilizes smart cards to carry keys which may be utilized by a host. In contrast, a stateless client of claim 1 is coupled to a server. In addition, the specification of the present application makes a distinction between a smart card and a stateless client (see e.g., specification Page 10, lines 19-20).

With respect to claim 1, the claimed invention includes the feature of at least one stateless client coupled to said at least one server. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Rubin only teaches that a smart card supplies a key to a host but does not

disclose or suggest that the smart card is a stateless client or that the smart card is coupled to the server. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Rubin does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention of claim 1 as is required to raise a prima facie case of obviousness.

With respect to claims 11 and 20, the claimed inventions include the feature of providing data associated with said session to said user at a first stateless client computer. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Rubin only discuss usage of a smart card but does not disclose or suggest a stateless client computer or providing data associated with said session to said user at the first stateless computer. Again, Rubin teaches that the smart card can provide a key to the host. In contrast, the claimed inventions of claims 11 and 20 has the feature where data associated with a session is provided to a user as the stateless client computer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the smart cards are not stateless clients as used and defined by the present application. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Rubin.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert and Rubin, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed inventions as is required to put forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

Claims 4-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert and Rubin as applied to claims 1-3 and 8-9 and further in view of Zhao (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,404). These rejections are respectfully traversed. The discussion regarding Lambert and Rubin are also applicable here. In addition, Zhao does not disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert, Rubin, Zhao, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of

the claims as is required to make a prima facie case of obviousness. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-5 and 7 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 15 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Zhao, and Rubin as applied to claims 11-12 and 20 and further in view of "Official Notice." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Applicants submit that the Office has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness with respect to claims 15 and 24 because the cited prior art and the "Official Notice" fail to disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client. Therefore, the cited prior art and the "Official Notice" do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed inventions.

Claims 19 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Zhao, and Rubin as applied to claims 11-12, 18 and 20 and further in view of Hamdi (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,124). These rejections are respectfully traversed. The discussion regarding Lambert, Rubin, and Zhao above are also applicable here. In addition, Hamdi does not disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lambert, Rubin, Zhao, and Hamdi individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the feature of a stateless client. Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited prior art references do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claims as is required to make a prima facie case of obviousness. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claimed inventions are allowable over the cited prior art. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the section 103 rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6900 ext. 6927. If any additional fees are due in

Application No. 09/727,969
Response dated July 22, 2004
Response to Office Action mailed April 22, 2004

connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP070).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edmund H. Mizumoto', written over the printed name.

Edmund H. Mizumoto
Reg. No. 46,938

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32291